REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated March 9, 2005, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Applicants acknowledged with appreciation an Examiner interview conducted on June 17, 2005. During the telephone interview, Applicants discussed certain claims and the outstanding rejections. Applicants and the Examiner agreed that a submission in writing would facilitate the Examiner's analysis.

Claims 1-30, 43 and 46 have been cancelled to expedite prosecution. Such cancellation should not be construed as an acquiesce in the rejection. Claims 31-42 and 44-45 are pending.

Claims 31-42, 44 and 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 6,545,601 to Monroe ("Monroe") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,698,021 to Amini et al. ("Amini"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,131,120 to Reid ("Reid")and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,271,752 to Vaios ("Vaios").

A *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) requires references that teach a suggestion of how to combine or modify the references so that the combination appears to be sufficient to have made the claimed invention obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. The Office Action failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for claims 31-42, 44 and 46 for at least the following reasons.

Claim 31 recites, *inter alia*, "wherein only the outside entity can terminate the communication session." The Examiner acknowledges that Monroe and Amini fail to teach this feature and relies on Vaios as allegedly teaching this feature. Applicants disagree that Vaios teaches "wherein only the outside entity can terminate the communication session."

In applying Vaios, the Examiner cites to column 8, line 35 to column 9, line 10. This section describes the local computer system awakening and sending a notification to the remote, outside entity. With respect to terminating the communication session, Vaios teaches "[t]he local computer system remains active and the video camera continues to record, as illustrated in step 316 , until the remote individual places the system back in sleep mode or a certain predetermined period of time lapses and the system automatically goes into

sleep mode." Vaios clearly teaches that the local computer system can terminate the communication session by automatically going in to sleep mode. This is inconsistent with claim 31 that recites "wherein only the outside entity can terminate the communication session." Thus, even if Vaios is combined with Monroe, Amini and Reid as proposed by the Examiner, the features of claim 31 are not taught.

For at least the above reasons, claim 31 is patentable over Monroe in view of Amini, Reid and Vaios. Claims 32-35 depend from claim 31 and are patentable over Monroe in view of Amini, Reid and Vaios for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 31.

Independent claims 36 and 41 recite features similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 31. Claims 37-40 depend from claim 36 and claims 42, 44 and 45 depend from claim 41. Thus, claims 36-42, 44 and 45 are patentable over Monroe in view of Amini, Reid and Vaios for at least the reasons advance with reference to claim 31.

Claim 45 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Monroe in view of Amini, Reid, Vaios and Kung. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 45 recites "wherein the triggering event is a call from a voice-over-Internet-protocol (VOIP) device." The Examiner relies on Kung as allegedly disclosing a call from a VOIP device as a triggering event. Kung does use the phrase "triggering event" in the context of handling a VOIP call, but the use of this phrase is not the same as that recited in claim 45. Kung references a triggering event related to call features of a call handled by a call manager. This triggering event in Kung is detected by a call manager handing a VOIP call. There is no discussion in Kung that the VOIP call is the triggering event itself, as recited in claim 45. The phrase "triggering event" in Kung is not equivalent to that recited in claim 45. In claim 45, the triggering event is associated with a situation and the triggering event is reported to an outside entity. The VOIP call in Kung is not a triggering event as recited in claim 45, but rather is simply a standard VOIP call, which a call manager processes in response to certain call feature triggering events. The reference to "triggering event" in Kung is not the same as that recited in claim 45.

For at least the above reasons, claim 45 is patentable over Monroe in view of Amini, Reid , Vaios and Kung.

For at least the reasons advanced above, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested. The Examiner is cordially requested to telephone, if the Examiner believes that it would be advantageous to the disposition of this case.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment, which may be required for this amendment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1130. In the event that an extension of time is required, or may be required in addition to that requested in any petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____

David A. Fox
Registration No. 38,807
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 36192

Date: July 11, 2005